IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No. 14184/2024
Decided on: 26.12.2024

Sanjay Kumar …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ….Respondents.

……

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner:	**Mr. Surender K. Sharma, Advocate.**
For the respondents:	**Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General Mr. Amandeep Sharma, Additional Advocate General.**

***Jyotsna Rewal Dua* , J**

Notice. Mr. Amandeep Sharma, learned Additional Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive relief:-

> *" That writ of mandamus may kindly be issue, directing the respondents to count the services of the petitioner since the initial date of his joining the services on contract basis for the purpose of seniority, promotion, increments, pensionery benefits and other consequential benefits in terms of the judgment dated 03.08.2023 passed by this Hon'ble in CWP No. 2004/2017 titled as Taj Mohammad Vs. State of H.P. (Annexure P-2)."*

3. According to the petitioner, the legal issue involved in the case has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the

[1] *Whether reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

petitioner is that his representation dated 26.07.2024 (Annexure P-3) has still not been decided by the respondents/competent authority.

4. Once the legal principle involved in the adjudication of present petition has already been decided, it is expected from the welfare State to consider and decide the representation of the aggrieved employee within a reasonable time and not to sit over the same indefinitely compelling the employee to come to the Court for redresssal of his grievances. This is also the purport and object of the Litigation Policy of the State. Not taking decision on the representation for months together would not only give rise to unnecessary multiplication of the litigation but would also bring in otherwise avoidable increase to the Court docket on unproductive government induced litigation.

5. In view of above, the instant petition is disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representation of the petitioner, in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also communicated to the petitioner. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

26th December, 2024(rohit)